# T – Implementation

**A. Interpretation – ‘**ought to be’ entails an ideal without an action or imperative. **Robinson[[1]](#footnote-1):**

Many **ought-sentences** are not prescriptive at all, either prudentially or morally, but express valuations. **Such as** "Everybody **ought to be happy**". This is **[are] not a prescription or command to anybody to act** or to refrain. **There is no possible act that would count as the fulfillment of the command**, if it were a command. Neither individually nor collectively can we make everybody happy. But the state of universal happiness **[it] is an ideal that we cherish;** and the sentence expresses this ideal. It is thus a valuation. **A valuation is something distinct from a prescription**, though they share the negative property of not being descriptions. Even when there is a possible act, the ought may be more ideal than prudential. The question "Do you think the hem of this dress ought to be higher?" suggests the practical possibility of raising the hem; but what the speaker has in mind is rather the question of beauty, of better- ness, of the ideal dress-length. "A clock ought to keep good time" is obviously not an imperative to clocks. Nor is it, except indirectly, a prescription to clockmakers and clockminders. It is a platitudinous restatement of the obvious ideal of a clock. (I take this example from Mellor's discussion of knowledge in Mind, 1967.) "You ought to feel ashamed" might be a moral ought if the speaker believed that we can feel what we will when we will; but usually it is the ideal ought. A man who feels shame after doing such an act is, in the speaker's opinion, a less bad man than one who does such an act and feels no shame. "Feel ashamed" does not refer to an action, a doing. **Wherever ought is followed by a nondoing infinitive**, as "to feel ashamed", **it is** likely to be **the ideal ought. An outstanding case of the nondoing infinitive is** "'to be"; and "**ought to be"** usually belongs to a sentence that expresses an ideal, not a command. "Everyone ought to be happy." "There ought to be a chicken in every pot." "Ought to have" is nearly the same. "Everyone ought to have a motor-car." "Everyone ought to have equal opportunity." "There ought to be a minimum wage" can perhaps be interpreted as a command to Parliament, and hence as the moral ought. Still more so the common phrase "There ought to be a law against it". But probably those who use such phrases rarely think of themselves as prescribing to Parliament; and what they say ought to exist is often something that cannot be brought into existence by the passage of a law. They are **expressing an ideal.**

**B. Violation –** They defend implementation

**C. Standards –**

**A) Textuality** - my def controls the internal link into any other standard because it’s prescribed by the text. That comes first because without it we literally don’t know what we’re debating in the first place. Valued is also in the past tense so it’s a retrospective claim rather than a passive claim.

**B) Predictability** – Valued is ‘highly regarded or esteemed’[[2]](#footnote-2) so it’s predictable that the res doesn’t prescribe action. I have the best def - first seven results that come up on Google indicate that it’s right. Open access dictionaries are the best gauges because they don’t exclude and are the first usages found.

**C) Ground** the can derive offense off-of a shift to a rehabilitative approach or a principle based approach while I can only get retribution on principle since **1)** Retributive topic literature is terrible, literally nobody advocates it in an ends based fashion and **2)** status quo policies are retributive so I can derive offense off of a shift in policy making.

**And,** drop the debater on T – **A)** they have no advocacy because they don’t defend any part of the resolution anymore so any offense they try to derive is impossible. **B)** The burden of the aff is to be topical axiomatically otherwise we get no substantive discussion in the first place. **C)** Any other argument they win is functionally severance because they’ve switched their advocacy in the rebuttal because it wasn’t topical.

**And,** no RVI on T – **A)** burden of the aff is to be topical in the first place, don’t reward him with a win just for understanding what it means to affirm a statement. **B)** If T’s an RVI affs will just read non-topical ACs all the time and prep out the T debate to screw over negs. Creates structural problems because the neg is destroyed on the theory debate and the substance debate because they have no offense.
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